

**REMARKS**

5 The Examiner's Office Action has been thoroughly considered. By way of the remarks herein, Applicant believes his application to be in condition for allowance.

In the instant Office Action, Examiner Nguyen has rejected independent Claims 1, 7 and 19, as well as dependent Claims 2 through 6 and 8 through 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Hopfer, U.S. Patent Number 4,392,108. In light of the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of  
10 their application, including their Claims 1 through 19.

**I. Rejection of Claims 1-19 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Independent Claims 1, 7 and 19, as well as dependent Claims 2 through 6 and 8 through 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hopfer,  
15 U.S. Patent Number 4,392,108. It is Applicant's understanding that the Examiner has rejected Claims 1 through 19 rejected by Examiner Nguyen in view of column 4, lines 60 through 65, and Figure 1 of the Hopfer patent.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's anticipation rejection. Hopfer reference teaches a radiation detector, which employs thin film resistive strips, each  
20 having an equivalent surface resistivity that is large compared to the characteristic impedance of free space. Applicants believe that the Hopfer reference further discloses a probe element having three loops (18, 20 and 22) constructed and mounted to extend in three orthogonal directions so as to interact respectively with three orthogonal components of the E-field, and which together operate for isotropic  
25 monitoring of free-space radiation.

Applicants' submit that the Hopfer reference fails to disclose or suggest the invention, as claimed. Applicant's claims, as amended, recite that "the probe conductor is equidistant with the insulator along the contact surface" in

independent Claims 1, 7 and 19. Applicant submit that the Hopfer reference neither teaches nor discloses a probe conductor being equidistant with the insulator along the contact surface. Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to page 3, lines 7 through 13, for one merely exemplary representation supporting this distinction.

5 Consequently, as the Hopfer reference fails to disclose or suggest the claimed invention, as found in amended independent Claims 1, 7 and 19, Applicant advances that the instant application defines novel and non-obvious matter.

Applicant submits that dependent Claims 2 through 6 and 8 through 18 are also not anticipated by the Hopfer reference. These dependent claims depend from  
10 independent claims, which are neither taught nor suggested by the Hopfer reference, as stated hereinabove. Consequently, in view of the above remarks, Applicants submit that dependent Claims 2 through 6 and 8 through 18 also define novel and non-obvious matter.

15 **II. Newly Inserted Dependent Claim 20**

Applicants contend that newly inserted dependent Claim 20 is not anticipated by the Hopfer reference. Applicants advance that as dependent claim 20 depends from independent Claim 19. As Claim 19 is neither taught nor suggested by the Hopfer reference, in view of the above remarks, Applicants submit that dependent  
20 Claim 20 defines novel and non-obvious matter.

**III. Summary and Conclusion**

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to Examiner Nguyen's Office Action. Thus, in view of the hereinabove remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of their patent application and its claims.

To that end, if the Examiner feels that a conference might expedite the prosecution of this case, he is cordially invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Ozer M. N. Teitelbaum  
Attorney for the Applicants  
Reg. No. 36,698  
(973)-386-8803

Date: **March 6, 2002**

Lucent Technologies Inc.  
101 Crawfords Corner Road (HO 3J-219)  
Holmdel, New Jersey 07733

VERSION OF CLAIMS SHOWING ACTUAL AMENDMENTS

5 --1. (Amended) An RF probe, comprising:

a conductive return;

10 a insulatoror[ing] having a contact surface;

a probe conductor [positioned] adjacent to the insulator[ing contact surface];  
and

15 a termination electrically positioned between the conductive return and the  
probe conductor, wherein the probe conductor is equidistant with the  
insulator along the contact surface.--

20 --4. (Amended) The RF probe of claim 3, wherein the probe conductor is formed  
within a coaxial conductor and the termination is [a resistor of] approximately 50  
ohms.--

25 --7. (Amended) An RF probe, comprising:

a conductive return;

a probe conductor [positioned] within an insulator, the insulator having a  
contact surface; and

a termination electrically positioned between the conductive return and the probe conductor, wherein the probe conductor is equidistant with the insulator along the contact surface. --

5

--10. (Amended) The RF probe of claim 9, wherein the probe conductor is formed within a coaxial conductor and the termination is [a resistor of] approximately 50 ohms.--

10

--16. (Amended) The RF probe of claim 15, wherein the termination is [a resistor of] approximately 50 ohms.--

15

--19. (Amended) An RF probe, comprising:

a conductive return;

20

a probe conductor positioned within an insulator having a contact surface, the probe conductor being curved and the insulator having at least a partial cross section that is substantially circular in a plane substantially perpendicular to the probe conductor; and

25

a termination electrically positioned between the conductive return and the probe conductor, wherein the probe conductor is equidistant with the insulator along the contact surface.--

--20. (Inserted) The RF probe of Claim 19, wherein the probe conductor is equidistant with an RF source along the contact surface.--